



## **Investing in Diversity: Enhancing Job Satisfaction among Faculty of Color through Work Environment**

Emi M. Kamei

Young K. Kim

*Azusa Pacific University, U.S.A.*

David Edens

*California State Polytechnic University-Pomona, U.S.A.*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*Using a quantitative research design, this study examined predictors of job satisfaction for faculty of color, and how these predictors may vary by racial/ethnic background within this population. Overall, this study provided support for previous research indicating lower levels of job satisfaction for faculty of color and highlighted the role of environmental factors associated with their job satisfaction. In particular, we found that institutional characteristics, teaching commitments, and research area of emphasis tended to significantly affect job satisfaction among faculty of color. In contrast to previous research, the results of this study demonstrated that service work was not significantly related to job satisfaction among this population. The study discusses the theoretical and practical implications of the findings.*

**Keywords:** faculty experience; faculty of color; institutional environment; job satisfaction and race/ethnicity

---

## INTRODUCTION

Earning promotion to senior rank or tenure is a meaningful demonstration of institutional commitment to a faculty member's professional career success. This support is particularly important for faculty of color whose knowledge has historically been excluded from academia (Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Sapeg, 2019). Earning promotion or tenure is not only an important benchmark in individual academic careers, but attainment of senior ranking also provides opportunities for leadership and cabinet-level positions, appointments to which can rebalance White-dominant power structures in higher education leadership governance (Arnold et al., 2016). National data, however, has indicated that faculty of color representation narrows to less than 20% of full-time professors in United States (U.S.) higher education institutions, reflecting continuing racial disparities in senior level positions (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). As diversity priorities and inclusion efforts undergo renewed emphasis in U.S. higher education institutions, additional information on faculty of color is needed to support their persistence in professional advancement.

Research has indicated that faculty job satisfaction is a primary focus area for faculty retention strategies. For example, the extent to which faculty reports satisfaction with both their assigned work duties and work environment has been associated with work productivity and departure decisions that may impact retention (Bruce, 2011; Pascale, 2018). The effects of work experiences on job satisfaction levels may be different for marginalized faculty of color who devote more of their professional time to service-related work, which includes many types of activities such as public engagement, student advising, and professional organization involvement (Hare, 2018; Wood et al., 2015). Despite their commitment to these service-related duties, such activities are often undervalued in promotion performance assessment, which affects performance evaluation stress for faculty of color (Domingo et al., 2022; Hanasono et al., 2019). High stress levels have been shown to significantly impact job satisfaction, which in turn may affect intentions to depart from the institution that jeopardize advancement to senior ranks (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2012). Although there has been broad evidence of disparate service workload expectations for faculty of color as compared to White faculty, less is known about the impact of workload activities on outcomes of satisfaction, which affect persistence to promotion or tenure. Therefore, an improved understanding of outcomes of satisfaction for faculty of color can help institutions better support their career persistence and, more broadly, achieve organizational goals of diverse representation in the body of faculty.

This study focused on job satisfaction for faculty of color to better understand the ways in which their professional experiences and institutional environment predict job satisfaction, and how such prediction may vary by racial backgrounds. The research questions guiding this study were as follows: (a) What is the level of job satisfaction for faculty of color? How does the level vary by the racial background of faculty of color? (b) What faculty experiences and institutional environments contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction for faculty of color? (c) How do such experiences and environments differ by the racial background of faculty of color?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Faculty Job Satisfaction and Retention**

Improving faculty job satisfaction remains a key consideration in faculty retention strategies. Research has shown that job satisfaction levels impact faculty work performance and productivity measures in accordance with achievement of the institutional educational mission, which may influence overall institutional ratings (Krueger et al., 2017; Roberts-Orr, 2022; Webber, 2019). Literature examining faculty job satisfaction tends to focus on variations in satisfaction related to individual characteristics, or on associations between satisfaction and the work environment (Webber, 2021). For example, prior findings have indicated variability in faculty job satisfaction by gender, race, and intersectional identities, and that faculty satisfaction may also be influenced by departmental workload distribution, cultural climate, or institutional type (Corneille et al., 2019; Lisnic et al., 2019; O'Meara et al., 2019). Many scholars seem to agree that although faculty job satisfaction in academic settings is certainly a multifaceted concept, social interactions and work environment conditions conjunctly influence faculty job satisfaction (Krueger et al., 2017; Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2011).

Hagedorn's (2000) proposed job satisfaction model, which cites Herzberg (1957), characterizes these work experiences and conditions as mediators that interact with or mitigate the effects of trigger variables. Hagedorn (2000) defined a trigger as "a significant life event" that is likely to activate change or motivate career-related decisions, such as life course changes, change in rank, or "change in perceived justice" (p. 7). The model conceptualizes a continuum of faculty satisfaction, from proactive engagement with work at one end to detachment at the other, with varying degrees of tolerance in between. There are mediators of satisfaction categorized as motivators, such as performing faculty work itself, recognition of achievements, salary, and advancement. Other mediators of one's current

location along the job satisfaction continuum include demographic factors of gender identity or discipline, and environmental influences such as peer relationships, student interactions, and the institutional culture. The theory proposes that these mediators work in a feedback loop and may mitigate or otherwise influence responses to triggers and alter satisfaction levels along the continuum that affects engagement with work. Hagedorn's findings (2000) suggested that three highly significant mediators that shift satisfaction level along the continuum from tolerant to engaged are the work itself, salary, and student relationships. These findings are aligned with other research highlighting the relationship between faculty workload and satisfaction, noting that intrinsic rewards from work may mitigate dissatisfaction with environment factors and are, thus, likely to have a significant impact on job satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; McNaughtan et al., 2022).

Findings are somewhat mixed in terms of the extent to which environmental factors impact satisfaction or whether workload factors can mediate satisfaction levels along the continuum. Some studies have suggested work environment factors such as collegiality and quality of social relationships are key contributors to greater job satisfaction for faculty (Bruce, 2011; Chonody et al., 2022). Others have noted the potential for work performance to lead to desired rewards is more likely to explain job satisfaction outcomes for faculty (Lyons & Akroyd, 2014; McNaughtan et al., 2022). For example, a prevalent suggestion in studies of faculty work performance is related to motivation-based theories, proposing that satisfaction is likely to result if employees perceive their work as valued and their performance will be recognized and appropriately rewarded (Ali, 2009; Lechuga, 2012; Smith et al., 2018). In their study of productivity, Mamiseishvili and Rosser (2011) found evidence that faculty with higher productivity in undergraduate teaching and service were less satisfied with their jobs and suggested that these workload factors may add to the burden without recognition or reward values, thus affecting faculty job satisfaction. As motivation theories suggest, if appropriate or equitable rewards play a key role in job satisfaction, then findings relating service work to low job satisfaction would suggest that service work is rewarded inequitably (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Lyons & Akroyd, 2014). There has been less evidence, however, that anticipated rewards alone can fully account for differences in job satisfaction among marginalized faculty whose service workload is larger and whose work experiences are notably disparate from those of their White peers (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Victorino et al., 2018). Taken together, prior research has suggested that Hagedorn's (2000) model of a job satisfaction continuum, affected by experiential motivators and

triggers that interact with (or possibly outweigh) situational dissatisfaction, may be experienced differently by faculty of color; this warranted further investigation into whether and how job satisfaction is associated with specific expectations of faculty work performance for faculty of color.

### **Concerns for Faculty of Color**

Research has indicated that faculty of color on the path to tenure are often confronted with compounding barriers to job satisfaction, including disparate teaching and service workloads, negative or biased peer interactions, and inconsistent performance expectations (Gumpertz et al., 2017; Matthew, 2016; Settles et al., 2020; Zambrana, 2018). In a study of women faculty and faculty of color, for instance, Settles et al. (2021) found that scholars of color were more likely to have the legitimacy of their scientific work challenged, and this devaluing of their work was associated with lower job satisfaction levels. Other studies have indicated that racial and/or gender identity biases may affect student interactions that can affect teaching performance evaluations, which are used to inform promotion decisions. Studies have shown student–faculty interactions may be a source of satisfaction for faculty of color that mediates intent to depart, despite other significant sources of stress or dissatisfaction with the environment (Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Sapeg, 2019). Other studies, however, have found that teaching or service workloads for faculty of color may cause greater stress when in competition with promotion-based activities (Katz, 2006; Surratt et al., 2011). Some women and faculty of color have reported that students are a significant source of their enjoyment at work, but others have noted that students who challenge their credibility in the classroom and return negative teaching evaluations can impact performance reviews (Fox Tree & Vaid, 2022; Kelly & Fetridge, 2012). These experiences of the academic work environment can have a dramatic impact on the level of professional satisfaction for faculty of color. Unsurprisingly, poor professional satisfaction is, in turn, negatively associated with retention; many faculty of color either end up leaving their institution in search of more supportive environments, or deciding to withdraw from the pursuit of promotion or tenure altogether.

### **Hidden Service**

Performance evaluation for promotion and tenure is typically assessed in terms of faculty contributions to research, teaching, and service to the university. Expectations for distribution of relative time and effort to each of these areas can vary depending on the institution, but as broad metrics for

career advancement in higher education, these three categories are consistent (Boyer, 1990; Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Rosser & Tabata, 2010). Notably, however, they are often disparately recognized and rewarded in terms of evaluation criteria for promotion in ways that disproportionately overburden or disadvantage faculty of color. In many cases, faculty achievements in research-related activities are tied to higher rewards than for teaching and service area duties, evincing a hierarchy of faculty work that conveys high value for research and disparages service work (Pascale, 2018; Webber, 2019). Regrettably, this prevalent culture disproportionately affects faculty of color, who are more likely to devote proportionally more of their efforts to service-related activities such as committee service, departmental projects, or participating in diversity-enhancement efforts (Hare, 2018; Wood et al., 2015).

This imbalance is often in large part a function of the already skewed availability of faculty of color. When departments and universities seek to include diverse perspectives yet have a scarcity of faculty of color whom they can involve, the task is often heaped on the same few overburdened individuals. This disparity has been documented as “minority” or cultural tax (Padilla, 1994) and is often termed as “hidden” service, referring to work activities that are not formally documented in terms of performance achievements but to which faculty devote significant professional effort (Hanasono et al., 2019; Hare, 2018). Previous research has suggested such hidden service activities may be related to job satisfaction levels. Due to expectations of service or, in some cases, volunteering to give their time to students of color or to social justice engagement, faculty of color’s service work has been associated with lower satisfaction with workload despite any personal satisfaction achieved (O’Meara et al., 2019).

### **Research Value and Recognition**

In addition to hidden service, faculty of color are also more likely to conduct their research in nontraditional research areas or methodologies, which also affects their opportunities for recognition in traditional review systems. Research has suggested that faculty of color with nontraditional research agendas frequently experience discouraging feedback from peers who are unfamiliar with the topics area or approach, and who may consequently disparage their inquiry process and devalue their scholarship as insignificant (Buchanan, 2020). These experiences have been found to impact psychological responses to their work and reduce job satisfaction. Settles et al. (2019) found that faculty participants felt ‘unsatisfied’ and ‘very unhappy’ about the lack of recognition of their scholarship” (p. 10). In conjunction with

higher service work, these value assessments of their work effectively convey a subordinate value of faculty of color's work in knowledge production, and may be correlated with increased stress levels to achieve in a system that undervalues their work, thereby affecting job satisfaction levels and, in turn, departure intentions (Settles et al., 2020).

### **Non-traditional Forms of Scholarly Engagement**

Scholars have long advocated for recognition of scholarly contributions beyond traditionally socialized academic achievements that emphasize research outputs through professional rewards over faculty work such as teaching or civic service engagement (Boyer, 1990; Zambrana, 2018). Some studies tend to characterize service work as internal or service to the institution, although some evidence has suggested that engagement in non-research and non-classroom teaching activities may provide a source of satisfaction that is not captured by this broad category (Gordon da Cruz, 2018). These work-related roles, such as extracurricular student life advising, interactions with student mentees outside of the classroom, or community-serving civic engagement, are also included in hidden service and can promote satisfaction via alignment between personal values and professional gratification, which in turn may be a source of fulfillment that stimulates work satisfaction levels (Turner et al., 2008). Research has also indicated that faculty of color often express interest in activities that center on serving their community or engagement in activism for social justice (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Settles et al., 2019). In some cases, faculty of color report receiving advice to change their focus of activities to increase achievements in conventional publication rather than projects that may be more personally meaningful or satisfactory (Settles et al., 2019). These experiences suggested that, despite derived meaning or fulfillment from work, their job satisfaction may be affected by work duties that are not formally connected to promotion or career advancement.

### **Conceptual Framework**

This study was guided by concepts from motivational theories tied to equitable rewards and from epistemic exclusion posited by Settles et al. (2020). Prior motivational models theorized that job satisfaction results from performance of one's work when high performance is expected to deliver fair rewards (Lawler & Porter, 1967, as cited in Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2011). Similarly, Ryan and Deci (2000) suggested that individual behaviors are likely to be motivated by rewards of an extrinsic nature when performance is valued by others to whom they are connected in significant ways. In the case

of faculty work responsibilities, these ideas frame faculty's job satisfaction outcomes in terms of feeling their work is valued by their colleagues and that the rewards for this valuable work are equitable. We considered these relationships among faculty work, the associated values of this work through professional rewards, and job satisfaction to conceptualize our analyses of faculty of color's job satisfaction outcomes.

Achievement of higher levels of job satisfaction, however, may be constrained for faculty of color whose research, teaching, or contributions of scholarship are often devalued, thus preventing access to satisfaction related to peers' esteem. In this study, we drew from prior work on epistemic exclusion by Settles et al. (2020), which theorized that conventional performance parameters are couched in racially biased perspectives about credible producers of knowledge, and which groups' knowledge is valued. Faculty's work performance tends to be evaluated based on their achievements as knowledge producers, and such achievement measures become designations of "what forms of knowledge (epistemology) are valued and which producers of knowledge are deemed legitimate" (Settles et al., 2020, p. 3). These systems of assessment privilege specific types of faculty members' work as rigorous, while disregarding contributions by faculty of color that fall outside of this definition as work, treating them as not valued, leaving their producers unrecognized as knowers. Considered together with conceptualizations of satisfaction as related to work that is valued and rewarded equitably, faculty of color's work becomes delegitimized and excluded, thereby affecting the level of satisfaction derived from work performance and inhibiting career advancement opportunities. The present study drew from these theories linking workload factors and satisfaction from rewards with concepts of epistemic exclusion that affect recognition and associated satisfaction with work for faculty of color.

## **METHODS**

### **Data Source and Sample**

This project used data from the 2016–2017 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey. The HERI Faculty Survey is a part of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the University of California, Los Angeles, a national longitudinal study of U.S. higher education. The CIRP is the largest and longest-running higher education survey of students and staff in the United States and has collected data on faculty who teach undergraduate students for over three decades. Utilizing closed-ended responses, the HERI Faculty Survey provides data on experiences of over 300,000 faculty nationwide at 2- and 4-year institutions.

HERI administers the Faculty Survey every three years over the course of approximately eight months from fall to spring. Faculties respond to survey items that refer to their professional activities over the past 3 years, including teaching practices, research and service engagement, and pedagogical techniques.

For this study, we obtained approval from HERI to use the data from the 2016–2017 Faculty Survey results. We limited the sample to full-time faculty participants, which included both tenure and nontenure track faculty. We cleaned the data to meet the assumptions of multiple regression and included only faculty members from four-year institutions. The final analytic sample included 19,082 responses. The racial composition of the sample included 6.4% Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI), 3.9% Black, 2.7% Hispanic, 80.5% White, and 6.5% other faculty.

### **Variables**

We selected two dependent variables measuring distinctive dimensions of job satisfaction: (a) satisfaction with compensation and (b) satisfaction with professional work environment. Both dependent variables were CIRP constructs of composite variable items as single score to better capture a more complex concept than separate job satisfaction ratings can convey. Satisfaction with compensation included salary and fringe benefit satisfaction in addition to satisfaction with professional workload and with opportunities for career advancement. The satisfaction with professional work environment variable included the following individual survey variables: satisfaction with autonomy, satisfaction with leadership, satisfaction with perceived equity, and satisfaction with work–life balance measures. Using both dependent variables was important to ensure consideration of a broader range of satisfaction elements to better describe a more holistic measure of faculty job satisfaction.

The independent variables for this study were selected based on literature pertaining to faculty job satisfaction that may impact the level of job satisfaction for faculty of color. Before analyzing the data, several variables were recoded or computed. We recoded institutional type and academic department into dichotomous variables. Based on factor analyses, we used individual survey items and composite variables to measure faculty’s teaching and related activities, service activities, and research or scholarly activities (RSCA).

## Analysis

Statistical analyses used in this study were one-way ANOVA and a series of logistic regressions. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) is a statistical method used to examine if there are significant differences between the means of three or more groups, and logistic regression is a technique used to test the relationship between a binary dependent variable and one or more independent variables. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 27.0. To answer the first research question, one-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare levels of job satisfaction among faculty by racial background. To address the second and third research questions, we performed a series of logistic regression models. First, we conducted a logistic regression analysis using the aggregate sample of faculty of color to examine factors that affected their satisfaction with compensation and the professional environment. We then conducted the logistic regression for each disaggregated racial group of faculty members of color to determine how the factors varied by faculty's racial/ethnic identity in each of the four race groups: Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI), Black, Hispanic, and other (i.e., other or multiracial).

## RESULTS

### Faculty of Color Job Satisfaction

As presented in Table 1, ANOVA results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean level of compensation satisfaction across different racial/ethnic groups of faculty. Overall, White faculty had the highest mean for satisfaction with compensation. Among faculty of color groups, AAPI faculty had the highest mean level of satisfaction with compensation, followed by Hispanic faculty, then Black faculty and other group.

**Table 1**

*Mean Levels of Satisfaction with Compensation across Racial/Ethnic Groups of Faculty*

Race group	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
AAPI	1,212	50.35	8.43	27.29	< .001
Black	735	50.00	8.64		
Hispanic	519	50.09	8.75		
White	15,369	51.34	8.58		
Other	1,247	49.06	8.98		
Total	19,082	51.04	8.63		

Note. Tukey post hoc testing showed a significant difference in the mean scores between AAPI and Black faculty, Black and Hispanic faculty, Hispanic and AAPI faculty, AAPI and other faculty, and other and Black faculty at the .05 level.

We conducted another one-way ANOVA on satisfaction with the professional work environment, and the results also showed a significant difference in the mean level of satisfaction across different racial/ethnic groups of faculties (see Table 2). Overall, White faculty had the highest mean of satisfaction with the professional environment. Among the faculty of color groups, Black faculty had the highest mean level of satisfaction, followed by AAPI faculty, then Hispanic faculty, and other faculties.

**Table 2**

*Mean Levels of Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment across Racial/Ethnic Groups of Faculty*

Race group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
AAPI	1,210	49.09	8.58	27.80	< .001
Black	736	49.40	9.04		
Hispanic	519	49.02	8.92		
White	15,360	50.53	8.72		
Other	1,243	48.37	9.23		
Total	19,068	50.21	8.79		

Note. Tukey post hoc testing showed a significant difference between White and all other racial groups.

### **Predictors of Job Satisfaction for Faculty of Color**

Table 3 presents the results of the first logistic regression analysis to answer the second research question. Regarding faculty satisfaction with compensation, results indicated that faculty of color working at Historically Black college or university (HBCU) institutions, private institutions, and research institutions tended to report higher satisfaction with compensation. No departmental or service level variables were significant predictors of satisfaction with compensation. The results also indicated that faculty of color who taught undergraduate students, faculty with a heavier workload of scheduled teaching, and those with higher preparation for teaching tended to report lower satisfaction with compensation. Faculty of color engaged in gender-focused research or writing topics also tended to report lower job satisfaction with compensation.

**Table 3***Predictors of Satisfaction with Compensation for Faculty of Color*

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Demographics	Female	-0.172	0.577	-0.01	-0.298	0.765
	Tenure status	0.13	0.368	0.012	0.353	0.724
	Citizen	0.062	0.708	0.003	0.088	0.93
Institution	HBCU	5.252	1.054	0.168	4.984	<0.001
	Private	1.31	0.606	0.075	2.163	0.031
	Research university	1.743	0.619	0.099	2.815	0.005
Department	English, Humanities, Fine Arts	-2.018	1.043	-0.081	-1.935	0.053
	Business and other nontechnical	-0.806	0.858	-0.037	-0.94	0.347
	Education Engineering and other technical Sciences including Ag, Bio, Health, Math, Physical	2.586	1.567	0.061	1.651	0.099
Service	Civic-minded practices	-2.015	1.044	-0.074	-1.931	0.054
	Committee work and meetings	0.752	0.806	0.039	0.933	0.351
	Number of letters of	-0.007	0.039	-0.006	-0.179	0.858
		-0.399	0.23	-0.056	-1.739	0.082
		0.132	0.187	0.023	0.709	0.478

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Teaching	recommen- dation written for graduate students					
	Taught undergra- duate students	-2.999	1.51	-0.062	-1.986	0.047
	Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)	-0.723	0.267	-0.101	-2.715	0.007
	Preparing for teaching (includin- g reading student papers and grading)	-0.546	0.195	-0.101	-2.799	0.005
	Taught an honors course	-0.134	0.665	-0.006	-0.201	0.841
	Taught an interdisci- plinary course	0.047	0.579	0.003	0.08	0.936
	Taught an area studies course (e.g., women's	1.133	0.789	0.051	1.437	0.151

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Research	studies, ethnic studies, LGBTQ studies)					
	Scholarly productivity	0.05	0.042	0.045	1.208	0.227
	International/global issues	-0.138	0.61	-0.008	-0.226	0.821
	Racial or ethnic minorities	-0.897	0.765	-0.051	-1.173	0.241
	Women or gender issues	-1.814	0.787	-0.099	-2.305	0.021
	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ) issues	1.188	0.925	0.046	1.284	0.199
Multi-discipline research	-1.365	0.76	-0.06	-1.796	0.073	

The second logistic regression analysis on satisfaction with the professional environment is presented in Table 4. Results showed female faculty of color tend to report lower job satisfaction with the professional work environment, while faculty working at HBCUs were more satisfied with the professional work environment. Faculty of color who are employed in private institutions tended to report a higher satisfaction with the professional workplace environment at a statistically significant level. Results also indicated that faculty of color in the education department tended to have greater satisfaction with professional workplace environment. The variables

related to service work did not have a statistically significant impact on satisfaction of faculty of color with the professional workplace. Two teaching-related variables were associated with lower satisfaction with the professional workplace: teaching undergraduate students and more time spent preparing for teaching. Regarding research activities, faculty engaged in gender-issues-related research or writing also tended to report lower job satisfaction.

**Table 4**

*Predictors of Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment for Faculty of Color*

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Demographics	Female	-1.485	0.61	-0.081	-2.435	0.015
	Tenure status	-0.625	0.389	-0.057	-1.608	0.108
Institution	Citizen HBCU	-0.777	0.748	-0.034	-1.038	0.299
	Private Research university	4.748	1.114	0.146	4.261	0.000
Department	English, humanities, fine arts	1.258	0.641	0.069	1.964	0.050
	Business and other nontechnical	-0.343	0.655	-0.019	-0.524	0.601
	Education	-2.022	1.103	-0.078	-1.833	0.067
	Engineering and other technical	1.459	0.907	0.064	1.608	0.108
	Sciences including ag, bio,	4.249	1.657	0.097	2.565	0.010
		-2.139	1.104	-0.076	-1.938	0.053
		0.656	0.853	0.033	0.77	0.442

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Service	health, math, physical	0.024	0.041	0.02	0.576	0.564
	Civic-minded practices	-0.293	0.243	-0.039	-1.207	0.228
	Committee work and meetings	-0.186	0.198	-0.031	-0.942	0.347
	Number of letters of recommendation written for graduate students	0.186	0.556	0.011	0.335	0.738
	Discussed career and post-graduation goals	-4.735	1.597	-0.094	-2.966	0.003
Teaching	Taught undergraduate students	-0.254	0.282	-0.034	-0.901	0.368
	Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)	-0.503	0.206	-0.09	-2.436	0.015
	Preparing for teaching (including reading student					

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Research	papers and grading)					
	Taught an honors course	-0.137	0.704	-0.006	-0.195	0.845
	Taught an interdisciplinary course	-0.506	0.612	-0.028	-0.827	0.408
	Taught an area studies course (e.g., women's studies, ethnic studies, LGBTQ studies)	1.13	0.834	0.049	1.355	0.176
	Scholarly productivity	0.011	0.044	0.009	0.246	0.806
	International/global issues	-1.123	0.645	-0.062	-1.74	0.082
	Racial or ethnic minorities	0.345	0.808	0.019	0.427	0.669
	Women or gender issues	-3.016	0.832	-0.158	-3.624	0.000
	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgen	1.398	0.978	0.052	1.43	0.153

Block	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
	der, queer (LGBTQ ) issues					
	Multi- disciplin e research	-1.198	0.804	-0.05	-1.49	0.136

### Job Satisfaction among Racial/Ethnic Subgroups

#### *Satisfaction with Compensation*

Table 5 presents the results for predictors of satisfaction with compensation by racial/ethnic group identities. The results showed that AAPI faculty at HBCUs tended to have higher satisfaction with compensation compared to their AAPI peers at non-HBCUs. Among AAPI faculty, faculty with higher teaching preparation hours and who reported engagement with research on gender-related issues tended to report lower job satisfaction with compensation than their counterparts. For Black faculty, working at an HBCU was a prominent predictor of higher job satisfaction, though other variables were not significant for this group. Results for Hispanic faculty showed three variables significantly predicted satisfaction with compensation: working at an HBCU tended to report higher satisfaction, although scheduled teaching and preparation for teaching significantly predicted lower satisfaction with compensation. When it came to the other group, faculty working at an HBCU tended to report greater satisfaction with compensation. Results also suggested that higher levels of scheduled teaching, preparation for teaching, and gender-focused research or writing were associated with lower satisfaction with compensation for this faculty group.

**Table 5**

*Predictors of Satisfaction with Compensation across Different Racial/Ethnic Groups of Faculty of Color*

Variable	AAPI		Black		Hispanic		Other	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
HBCU	0.078	0.09	0.281	<0.01	0.142	0.002	0.11	<0.001

Private institution	0.026	0.381	0.067	0.086	0.057	0.207	0.054	0.061
Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)	-0.063	0.060	-0.036	0.397	-0.184	0.000	-0.17	<0.001
Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)	-0.076	0.023	-0.029	0.492	-0.148	0.004	-0.072	0.022
Women and gender studies	-0.082	0.006	0.056	0.134	-0.048	0.281	-0.104	<0.001

### Satisfaction with the Professional Work Environment

Table 6 presents results on predictors of satisfaction with the professional work environment by racial/ethnic group identities. The results showed AAPI faculty working at private institutions tended to report higher job satisfaction with the professional work environment than their AAPI peers working at public institutions. Among AAPI faculty, those who focused on gender-related topics for research and writing tended to report lower job satisfaction with the professional work environment. For Black faculty, working at an HBCU and working at a private institution significantly predicted higher satisfaction with the professional environment. Hispanic faculty working at an HBCU tended to report higher job satisfaction. The results suggested that three variables predicted lower satisfaction with the professional work environment for Hispanic faculty, including scheduled teaching, preparation for teaching, and working on women or gender issues. Results for the other group indicated that female faculty had lower job satisfaction with the professional work environment. Faculty of other

racial/ethnic identities working at an HBCU and at private institutions were more satisfied with the professional work environment compared to their counterparts. Results also suggested that higher preparation for teaching and gender-focused research or writing were associated with lower satisfaction with the professional work environment for this group of faculties.

**Table 6**

*Predictors of Satisfaction with Professional Environment across Different Racial/Ethnic Groups of Faculty of Color*

Variable	AAPI		Black		Hispanic		Other	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Female	-	0.17	-	0.49	-	0.27	-	0.01
	0.04	3	0.02	8	0.05	9	0.07	5
	2		6		1		4	
HBCU	0.05	0.06	0.20	<0.0	0.11	0.01	0.05	0.04
	6	6	7	01	3	4	9	7
Private institution	0.08	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.07	0.13	0.12	<0.0
	7	4	7	8		2	3	01
Department:	-	0.58	-0.01	0.79	-	0.57	0.00	0.80
	0.01	6		2	0.02	2	7	9
Education	7				6			
Taught undergraduate students	-	0.23	-	0.13	-	0.02	0.00	0.96
	0.03	4	0.05	1	0.10	8	1	7
	6		9		1			
Preparing for teaching	-	0.05	-	0.55	-	0.00	-	0.00
	0.05	5	0.02		0.15	1	0.08	5
	8		3		9		4	
Women or gender issues	-	0.00	-	0.35	-	0.04	-	<0.0
	0.08	9	0.03	3	0.09	1	0.11	01
	1		7		6		4	

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study aimed to examine factors of impact on job satisfaction for faculty of color, and how these may vary by faculty of color's racial backgrounds. Overall, this study provided support for previous research indicating lower levels of job satisfaction for faculty of color (Settles et al., 2021; Webber, 2019) and highlighted the role of environment factors associated with job satisfaction (Pascale, 2018; Webber, 2019). In contrast to previous research indicating undervaluing of service work and service work

association with lower job satisfaction, the results did not show that service work was significantly related to lower job satisfaction (Domingo et al., 2022; Hare, 2018). Overall, workload factors related to teaching commitments and research areas of emphasis tended to affect faculty of color toward lower job satisfaction. The results of this study indicate that for faculty of color, structural environment factors are likely to contribute to higher levels of faculty job satisfaction with compensation and the professional work environment.

For the first research question, we found the level of job satisfaction with compensation and the professional environment for faculty of color was not significantly different across racial groups; however, the job satisfaction was lower than that of White faculty. This finding was consistent with prior studies that found experience higher stress levels associated with lower job satisfaction among faculty of color (Jayakumar et al., 2009). This finding suggests that, overall, faculty of color tends to be less satisfied with compensation-related factors of workload and professional advancement opportunities. Additionally, lower satisfaction with the professional work environment may point to barriers and disparities in faculty of color's workload and salary equity concerns. O'Meara et al. (2019) found faculty were more likely to be satisfied with their teaching and service work assignments when they perceived these assignments to be equitable. Similarly, the finding that lower level of satisfaction was associated with being a faculty member of color may point to the effects of disparities in hidden service; faculty job satisfaction levels with potential professional advancement and autonomy may be lower due to under-rewarded service activities and other work that goes unrecognized in promotion consideration. This result also aligned with consistent findings about the lack of clarity in promotion and tenure processes, which increase professional stress and reduce satisfaction with professional advancement opportunities (Edwards & Ross, 2018).

### **Satisfaction with Compensation**

We found faculty of color at HBCUs tended to have higher levels of satisfaction with compensation at a statistically significant level. Taking into consideration previous findings that faculty of color in White dominant academic settings experience racially-based bias and devaluation of their scholarly work, these findings suggested that structural environment factors may play an important role in faculty of color job satisfaction (Matthew, 2016; Settles et al., 2020). In an HBCU setting, faculty may experience environmental or cultural supports that align with feeling valued, supporting

the legitimacy of their work. These environmental elements can provide opportunities for scholarly pursuits and professional advancement opportunities that increase satisfaction levels with compensation. The results also indicated that faculty of color in research institutions tended to report higher satisfaction with compensation than those in nonresearch institutions. One possible explanation for this finding was that despite more emphasis on mainstream research that may seem disadvantageous for faculty of color, research institutions often have more resources to direct toward scholarly prospects that can provide a motivating environment through which engagement with one's work is increased, thus raising job satisfaction with compensation.

Somewhat surprisingly, the study results did not show a statistically significant association between service work and satisfaction with compensation, either positive or negative. This finding contrasts with previous work that has connected this area of work to satisfaction levels. Previous evidence indicates that more service work is significantly associated with lower job satisfaction (Hare, 2018). By contrast, Pascale (2018) found that committee service was associated with satisfaction with job security and perhaps this specific type of service work may be an explanation for this finding. Despite evidence that, specifically, faculty of color are overburdened with committee service, these activities may provide opportunities to engage with other faculty with whom they may not otherwise have the opportunity to collaborate, which can result in publishing or other scholarly opportunities and raise satisfaction.

In the workload area of teaching, variables of scheduled teaching and preparing for teaching were predictors of a decrease in satisfaction with compensation. This finding was aligned with prior research that connected teaching demands to increased stress levels and intention to depart, given the potential for teaching duties to compete with research activities used in professional advancement (Pascale, 2018; Surratt et al., 2011). The tension between teaching-related workload burden and satisfaction with compensation may be affected by the dual impact of time taken up by teaching duties rather than allocated toward research collaboration or publication writing, and institutional practices that favor research, such as providing course-releases from teaching that motivate faculty to work toward higher-valued research work (Pascale, 2018). This finding may be related to awareness about disparities in rewards for workload that deters teaching and student-related work in which faculty of color engage at high levels, leading to a perception of less equitable compensation for such work.

## **Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment**

As part of Research Question 2, we examined a second variable of satisfaction with the professional work environment. We found that institutional factors were significantly associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, specifically, HBCU and private institutions. This result suggests that structural or environmental factors in these organizations may be more satisfactory to faculty of color. One possibility is that an environment in which White faculty are not dominant may provide a setting in which faculty of color feel more readily that their work and research are valued rather than challenged by their colleagues. Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) found peer validation and the value of one's scholarship were strong predictors of satisfaction, and it may be the case that a similar experience has been occurring at a high level for faculty of color in HBCU and private institution settings.

The results show that faculty who devoted more time to teaching undergraduate students or to teaching preparation tended to have lower satisfaction with the professional work environment. This was also our result for satisfaction with compensation variable and aligned with prior evidence that teaching was associated with low job satisfaction. In this case, such a result may be related to lower levels of autonomy and flexibility, which are part of the professional environment satisfaction construct. Teaching assignments impose scheduled requirements and involve higher effort for preparation and may not permit the flexibility or independence of work schedule to pursue other scholarly endeavors. Previous research has also highlighted teaching activities as less valued than other areas of faculty work, suggesting that expected rewards may be disproportionate to the associated burden or work (Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2011).

We also found faculty of color conducting research or writing in areas of gender issues tended to have lower satisfaction with the professional environment. This finding was perhaps not surprising, given previous evidence that minoritized populations of faculty of color and women have experienced devaluation of their scholarly work, particularly at research institutions (Settles et al., 2020). Settles et al. (2020) found faculty of color experienced challenges to their credibility as researchers and knowledge producers; as a defining aspect of faculty professional work, this experience can be detrimental to persistence and engagement associated with lower satisfaction with the professional work environment. Other evidence has indicated that collegiality of one's work environment is a strong contributor to faculty of color satisfaction (Chonody et al., 2022). Taken together, these

studies suggested that faculty of color's satisfaction in the professional work environment may increase if they were to have greater peer support for their gender-related studies. This finding, however, indicated that faculty of color who studied gender-related issues may be less satisfied because they are more aware of disparities between their work and the others' work or do not perceive equitable validation or autonomy in doing their work.

### **Satisfaction Outcomes by Race Group**

Results indicated that the major contributors to job satisfaction vary by race identity group. For example, Hispanic faculty and other/multiracial faculty with higher scheduled teaching duties tended to report lower satisfaction with compensation, although scheduled teaching was not a significant predictor of compensation satisfaction for AAPI and Black faculty. Additionally, faculty with greater teaching preparation also had lower satisfaction with compensation, except for Black faculty. By comparison, Hispanic and other/multiracial faculty with higher teaching preparation were less satisfied with the professional work environment, yet teaching variables were not significantly predictive for AAPI and Black faculty. These differing results provided an informative depiction of how faculty of color experience the impact of workload. Some prior evidence has suggested that student-related or student-facing work is often a priority for faculty of color, though in some cases these activities are considered under service work rather than teaching (Turner et al., 2008; Wood et al., 2015). Teaching expectations and perceived lower rewards may be viewed differently among faculty of color groups, as some may view teaching as competing with other demands. Other research, however, found some faculty of color experienced their student relationships as a support team that provided fulfillment through mentoring and motivated their scholarly activities toward promotion, potentially in environments where such support was not available from colleagues (Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020). Given these experiences, these results may be related to the variance of perceived benefits of teaching activities.

Notably, satisfaction with compensation was predicted by HBCU institutions for all groups, while satisfaction with the professional environment was significant for Black, Hispanic, and other/multiracial faculty and not for AAPI faculty. Private institutions predicted professional environment satisfaction for all groups except Hispanic faculty. These results offered some more nuanced insight into considerations of the role of professional environment satisfaction among faculty of color groups. For example, the findings for compensation satisfaction aligned with research suggesting lower values for teaching; however, in terms of environment

satisfaction, scheduled teaching predicted lower satisfaction only among Hispanic faculty. In addition, higher teaching preparation predicted significantly lower professional environment satisfaction only for Hispanic and other faculties, and not AAPI or Black faculty. This distribution was unique and may suggest that factors of the professional environment can mediate dissatisfaction associated with lower-reward activities for some faculty groups. An additional inquiry into the variance among faculty of color groups is warranted by these unique results.

## CONCLUSION

The findings from this study reflected that increase in faculty's job satisfaction seemed to be more related to structural factors, such as institution type, institutional control, and department. An overall observation that these findings suggest is that for this population of faculty of color, the environmental or departmental factors appear more likely to affect job satisfaction than any specific workload factors. The significant predictors of increased job satisfaction with both compensation and the professional work environment were related to institution type; while teaching and undergraduate teaching were the stronger predictors of lower satisfaction. From a motivational perspective, these findings may be reflective of faculty of color's perceptions that teaching contributions are unlikely to yield equitable rewards or greater compensation, and in fact, may detract from potential scholarly achievement in other areas. Findings from this study provided new insights into faculty of color's satisfaction that can benefit practices in recruitment and retention.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, P. (2009). Job satisfaction characteristics of higher education faculty by race. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 4(5), 289–300.  
[https://academicjournals.org/article/article1379610760\\_Ali.pdf](https://academicjournals.org/article/article1379610760_Ali.pdf)
- Arnold, N. W., Crawford, E. R., & Khalifa, M. (2016). Psychological heuristics and faculty of color: Racial battle fatigue and tenure/promotion. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(6), 890–919.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11780891>
- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher*

- Education*, 82(2), 154–186.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2011.11779090>
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bruce, D. S. (2011). Intent to leave the professoriate: The relationship between race/ethnicity and job satisfaction for pre-tenured professors in doctorate-granting universities (Publication No. 3494830) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Buchanan, N. T. (2020). Researching while Black (and female). *Women and Therapy*, 43(1–2), 91–111.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02703149.2019.1684681>
- Chonody, J., Kondrat, D., Godinez, K., & Kotzian, A. (2022). Job satisfaction amongst social work faculty: The role of relationships. *Journal of Social Work Education, Advance on*, 1–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2021.2019638>
- Corneille, M., Lee, A., Allen, S., Cannady, J., & Guess, A. (2019). Barriers to the advancement of women of color faculty in STEM: The need for promoting equity using an intersectional framework. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 38(3), 328–348. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-09-2017-0199>
- Domingo, C. R., Gerber, N. C., Harris, D., Mamo, L., Pasion, S. G., Rebanal, R. D. & Rosser, S. V. (2022). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 15(3), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000292>
- Edwards, W. J., & Ross, H. H. (2018). What are they saying? Black faculty at predominantly white institutions of higher education. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(2), 142–161.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1391731>
- Fox Tree, J. E., & Vaid, J. (2022). Why so few, still? Challenges to attracting, advancing, and keeping women faculty of color in academia. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 6(January), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.792198>
- Guillaume, R. O., & Apodaca, E. C. (2020). Early career faculty of color and promotion and tenure: the intersection of advancement in the academy and cultural taxation. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 25(4), 546–563.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1718084>
- Gumpertz, M., Durodoye, R., Griffith, E., & Wilson, A. (2017). Retention and promotion of women and underrepresented minority faculty in science and engineering at four large land grant institutions. *PLoS ONE*, 12(11), 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187285>
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff*. Jossey-Bass.
- Hanasono, L. K., Broido, E. M., Yacobucci, M. M., Root, K. V., Peña, S., & O’Neil, D. A. (2019). Secret service: Revealing gender biases in the

- visibility and value of faculty service. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 12(1), 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000081>
- Hare, H. E. (2018). *Service work of underrepresented faculty* [Unpublished doctoral Dissertation]. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 538–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11779031>
- Katz, S. N. (2006). What has happened to the professoriate? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(27), B46. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/what-has-happened-to-the-professoriate/>
- Kelly, B. T., & Fetridge, J. S. (2012). The role of students in the experience of women faculty on the tenure track. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 5(1), 21–45. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njawhe-2012-1095>
- Krueger, P., White, D., Meaney, C., Kwong, J., Antao, V., & Kim, F. (2017). Predictors of job satisfaction among academic family medicine faculty. *Canadian Family Physician*, 63, 177–185.
- Lechuga, V. M. (2012). Latino faculty in STEM disciplines: Motivation to engage in research activities. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 11(2), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2012.659564>
- Lisnic, R., Zajicek, A., & Morimoto, S. (2019). Gender and race differences in faculty assessment of tenure clarity: The influence of departmental relationships and practices. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 5(2), 244–260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649218756137>
- Lyons, F. W., & Akroyd, D. (2014). The impact of human capital and selected job rewards on community college faculty job satisfaction. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(2–3), 194–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.851965>
- Mamiseishvili, K., & Rosser, V. J. (2011). Examining the relationship between faculty productivity and job satisfaction. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 2011, 5(2), 100–132.
- Martinez, M. A., Chang, A., & Welton, A. D. (2017). Assistant professors of color confront the inequitable terrain of academia: A community cultural wealth perspective. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 20(5), 696–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1150826>
- Matthew, P. A. (2016). *Written/unwritten: Diversity and the hidden truths of tenure*. University of North Carolina Press. [http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9781469627724\\_matthew](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9781469627724_matthew)
- McNaughtan, J., Eicke, D., Thacker, R., & Freeman, S. (2022). Trust or self-determination: Understanding the role of tenured faculty empowerment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 93(1), 137–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2021.1935601>
- Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The*

- Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282–310.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2007.0018>
- O’Meara, K., Lennartz, C. J., Kuvaeva, A., Jaeger, A., & Misra, J. (2019). Department conditions and practices associated with faculty workload satisfaction and perceptions of equity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 90(5), 744–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2019.1584025>
- Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, 23(4), 24–27.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1176259>
- Pascale, A. B. (2018). Supports and pushes: Insight into the problem of retention of STEM women faculty. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 11(3), 247–264.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2018.1423999>
- Roberts-Orr, M. D. (2022). *Effects of job performance and job satisfaction on faculty turnover intention in higher education* (Publication No. 29397697) [Doctoral dissertation, Trident University International] ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Rosser, V. J., & Tabata, L. N. (2010). An examination of faculty work: Conceptual and theoretical frameworks in the literature. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol 25, pp. 449–475). SpringerLink. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8598-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8598-6_12)
- Ryan, J. F., Healy, R., & Sullivan, J. (2012). Oh, won’t you stay? Predictors of faculty intent to leave a public research university. *Higher Education*, 63(4), 421–437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9448-5>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Sapeg, R. (2019). *Exclusion in academia: Latina faculty struggle towards tenure* (Publication No. 10622753) [Doctoral dissertation, St. Thomas University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. C. T., & Dotson, K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized: (In)visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113(2019), 62–74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003>
- Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Brassel, S. T. (2021). Epistemic exclusion of women faculty and faculty of color: Understanding scholar(ly) devaluation as a predictor of turnover intentions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 93(1), 31–55.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2021.1914494>
- Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2020). Epistemic exclusion: Scholar(ly) devaluation that marginalizes faculty of color.

- Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 14(4), 493–507.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174>
- Smith, J. L., Handley, I. M., Rushing, S., Belou, R., Shanahan, E. A., Skewes, M. C., Kambich, L., Honea, J., & Intemann, K. (2018). Added benefits: How supporting women faculty in STEM improves everyone's job satisfaction. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11(4), 502–517.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000066>
- Surratt, C. K., Kamal, K. M., & Wildfong, P. L. D. (2011). Research funding expectations as a function of faculty teaching/administrative workload. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 7(2), 192–201.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2010.04.006>
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012837>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2019). *Full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2017, Fall 2018, and Fall 2019*. Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.  
[https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20\\_315.20.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_315.20.asp)
- Victorino, C., Nylund-Gibson, K., & Conley, S. (2018). Prosocial behavior in the professoriate: A multi-level analysis of pretenured faculty collegiality and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(5), 783–798. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2017-0258>
- Webber, K. L. (2011). Measuring faculty productivity. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *University rankings* (pp. 105–121). Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1116-7>
- Webber, K. L. (2019). Does the environment matter? Faculty satisfaction at 4-year colleges and universities in the USA. *Higher Education*, 78(2), 323–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0345-z>
- Webber, K. L. (2021). Culture matters: Faculty satisfaction in four-year postsecondary institutions. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 35(3), 31–43.
- Wood, J. L., Hilton, A. A., & Nevarez, C. (2015). Faculty of color and White faculty: An analysis of service in colleges of education in the Arizona public university system. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 81(1), 85–109.
- Zambrana, R. E. (2018). *Toxic ivory towers: The consequences of work stress on underrepresented minority faculty*. Rutgers University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813593012>

---

**EMI M. KAMEI, Ph.D.**, serves as a Research Development Officer for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University. She received her Ph.D. from Azusa Pacific University.

**YOUNG K. KIM, Ph.D.**, is a Professor of Educational Leadership at Azusa Pacific University. Her research interests include conditional college impact, college experience and outcomes among minoritized college students, and STEM in higher education. Email: [ykkim@apu.edu](mailto:ykkim@apu.edu).

**DAVID EDENS, Ph.D.**, is a Professor at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. His research has focused on success and learning in higher education among diverse populations including international and non-traditional college learners.

*Manuscript submitted: April 26, 2023*

*Manuscript revised: November 26, 2024*

*Accepted for publication: August 30, 2025*